arXiv:1001.0439v1 [math.PR] 4 Jan 2010

Existence and Comparisons for BSDEs in general spaces

Samuel N. Cohen
University of Adelaide
samuel.cohen@adelaide.edu.au

Robert J. Elliott*
University of Adelaide and University of Calgary
relliott@ucalgary.ca

January 4, 2010

Abstract

We present a theory of Backward Stochastic Differential Equations in continuous time with an arbitrary filtered probability space. No assumptions are made regarding the continuity of the filtration, or of the predictable quadratic variations of martingales in this space. We present conditions for existence and uniqueness of square-integrable solutions, using Lipschitz continuity of the driver. These conditions unite the requirements for existence in continuous and discrete time, and allow discrete processes to be embedded with continuous ones. We also present conditions for a comparison theorem, and hence construct time consistent nonlinear expectations in these general spaces. MSC Classification: 60H20, 60H10, 91B16

1 Introduction

The theory of Backward Stochastic Differential Equations (BSDEs) has been extensively studied. Typically, most results have been obtained only in the context of a filtration generated by a Brownian motion, possibly with the addition of Poisson jumps. Specifically, attention has been given to equations of the form

$$dY_t = F(\omega, t, Y_{t-}, Z_t) - Z_t^* dM_t; \qquad Y_T = Q$$

where M is the martingale generating the filtration (typically Brownian motion), T is a fixed finite terminal time, $Q \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is a stochastic terminal value, F is a progressively measurable function, $[\cdot]^*$ denotes matrix/vector transposition (and hence A^*B denotes the inner product of A and B), and the solution is a square integrable pair of processes (Y, Z), where Y is adapted and Z is predictable.

---

*Robert Elliott wishes to thank the Australian Research Council for support.

A notable exception to this is the work of [12], where a general probability space is considered. In the case considered in [12], the martingale M is specified *a priori*, and the equation considered is

$$dY_t = F(\omega, t, Y_{t-}, Z_t)dC_t - Z_t^* dM_t - dN_t; \qquad Y_T = Q, \tag{1}$$

where each term is as above, the filtration is quasi-left continuous, C is a continuous process such that $d\langle M\rangle$ is absolutely continuous with respect to dC and N is a martingale strongly orthogonal to M, that is, $\langle M, N\rangle = 0$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot\rangle$ denotes the predictable quadratic covariation process.

These equations depend heavily on the continuity of C, and therefore, are unable to deal with any situation where martingales may jump at a point with positive probability. However, these situations may arise in various applications. Similarly, if we consider embedding a discrete time process in continuous time, we obtain processes which jump with positive probability at every integer.

A significant use of these equations is to generate 'nonlinear expectations' or 'nonlinear evaluations', in the sense of [16]. These are operators

$$\mathcal{E}(\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t) : L^2(\mathcal{F}_T) \to L^2(\mathcal{F}_t)$$

satisfying certain basic properties. They have important applications in mathematical finance and stochastic control. Given the results of [9] and [14], it is known that in the Brownian setting, under certain conditions, these operators are completely described by BSDEs. Furthermore, it is clear, given the comparison theorem in [8], BSDEs of the form of (1) in arbitrary spaces, under some conditions, also describe nonlinear expectations. However, it is not known how large a class of nonlinear expectations in a general space is given by a BSDE.

To establish such a result for BSDEs of the form of (1) one faces a significant problem. If $\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t) = Y_t$ is given as the solution to (1), once M is fixed, for any martingale N orthogonal to M, we have the property

$$\mathcal{E}(Q + N_T|\mathcal{F}_t) = \mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t).$$

This property is clearly not true for most nonlinear expectations, whenever there are nontrivial examples of such processes N, which is not the case in the Brownian setting (as a martingale representation theorem holds). It follows that these equations cannot describe any nonlinear expectations which do not possess this property.

Furthermore, the fact that the martingale M must be specified a priori is arguably unsatisfying. Conceptually, it may be preferable if, in some sense, the probability space itself dictated what martingales are needed for the BSDE. In this case, one could proceed either by specifying the probability space using a collection of martingales, (which, given a representation theorem holds, will then describe all martingales in the space), or vice versa.

In this paper we establish such a general result. We show that there is a sense in which the original BSDE can be interpreted in a general space, using only a separability assumption on $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$. We establish conditions on the existence and uniqueness of BSDEs in this setting, where the driver is integrated with respect to an arbitrary deterministic Stieltjes measure (Theorem 6.2). We also prove a comparison theorem for these solutions, which shows under which conditions they do indeed describe nonlinear expectations and evaluations.

2 Martingale Representations

The key result used in the construction of BSDEs is the Martingale representation theorem. In the Brownian setting, this result is well known, (see, for example [18, Ch V.3] or [13, Thm 12.33]). In other cases, for example when dealing with martingales generated by Markov chains, a similar result is available, (see [4]), however it is also known that there exist probability spaces in which no finite dimensional martingale representation theorem exists.

Consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}, t \in [0,T]$ satisfying the usual conditions. The time-interval $[0,T]$ is given the Borel σ-field $\mathcal{B}([0,T])$.

Definition 2.1. *For any nondecreasing process of finite variation μ, we define the measure induced by μ to be the measure over $\Omega \times [0,T]$ given by*

$$A \mapsto E\left[\int_{[0,T]} I_A(\omega,t)d\mu\right].$$

Here $A \in \mathcal{F} \vee \mathcal{B}([0,T])$, and the integral is taken pathwise in a Stieltjes sense.

Under the assumption that the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is separable, a paper, Davis and Varaiya [10], gives the following result.

Theorem 2.1 (Martingale Representation Theorem; [10])**.** *Suppose $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is a separable Hilbert space, with an inner product $(X,Y) = E[XY]$. Then there exists a finite or countable sequence of square-integrable martingales $M^1, M^2, \dots$ such that every square integrable martingale M_t has a representation*

$$M = M_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{]0,t]} Z^i_u dM^i_u$$

for some sequence of predictable processes Z^i. This sequence satisfies

$$E\left[\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{[0,T]} (Z^i_u)^2 d\langle M^i\rangle_u\right] < +\infty. \tag{2}$$

These martingales are orthogonal (that is, $E[M^i_T M^j_T] = 0$ for all $i \neq j$), and the predictable quadratic variation processes $\langle M^i\rangle$ satisfy

$$\langle M^1\rangle \succ \langle M^2\rangle \succ \dots,$$

where $\succ$ denotes absolute continuity of the induced measures. Furthermore, these martingales are unique, in that if N^i is another such sequence, then $\langle N^i\rangle \sim \langle M^i\rangle$, where $\sim$ denotes equivalence of the induced measures in the sense of Definition 2.1.

Corollary 2.1.1. *For any predictable processes Z^i satisfying (2), the process $\sum_i \int_{]0,t]} Z^i_u dM^i_u$ is well defined, and is a square-integrable martingale.*

Remark 2.1. When a finite dimensional martingale representation theorem holds, as when the space is generated by a Brownian motion, then all but finitely many of the martingales M^i given by Theorem 2.1 will be zero. We shall not, in general, assume that this is the case, but acknowledge that, in this situation, significant simplification of the equations considered is possible.

We shall use this result to construct a form of BSDE on this general space.

Definition 2.2. *We denote by* $\mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$ *the space of infinite* $\mathbb{R}^K$ *valued sequences. We note that the predictable processes* Z^i *in Theorem 2.1 can be written as a vector process* Z*, which takes values in* $\mathbb{R}^{1\times\infty}$*.*

3 BSDEs in general spaces – a definition

We seek to construct BSDEs, assuming only the usual properties of the filtration and that $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is a separable Hilbert space. For simplicity, we shall also assume that $\mathcal{F}_0$ is trivial, which, by right continuity, ensures that, almost surely, no martingale has a jump at $t = 0$.

Definition 3.1. *Let* μ *be a deterministic signed Stieltjes measure. For* $K \in \mathbb{N}$*, a BSDE is an equation of the form*

$$Q = Y_t - \int_{]t,T]} F(\omega, u, Y_{u-}, Z_u) d\mu_u + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{]t,T]} Z_u^i dM_u^i \tag{3}$$

where $Z_t(\omega)$ *is the (countably infinite) vector with entries* $Z_t^i(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^K$*. For a terminal value* $Q \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^K; \mathcal{F}_T)$*, a predictable,* $d\mu \times d\mathbb{P}$ *progressively measurable* driver *function* $F : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty} \to \mathbb{R}^K$*, a solution is a pair of processes* (Y, Z) *taking values in* $\mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$*, where* Z *is predictable and* Y *is adapted. We shall restrict our attention to the case when* Y *is square integrable and* Z *satisfies (2).*

Remark 3.1. We note that this type of equation encompasses all previously studied forms of BSDEs. When the filtration is Brownian, we can take M^i to be the i'th component of the generating Brownian motion, $\mu = t$, and the equation is standard. When the filtration is generated by a Poisson random measure and a Brownian motion, as in [2] and others, or by a Markov chain, as in [4], [6], we have similar a similar reduction. When we consider the analogous equations in discrete time, we can form the discrete-time filtration embedded in this continuous time context (see [15, Ch 1f]), and hence obtain the Backward Stochastic Difference Equations considered in [7] and [5]. (However these last two works consider equations in discrete time without the restrictions of square-integrability throughout.)

Comparing with the work of [12], we see that if F depends only on the projection of Z into a finite-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$, then it is possible to reduce the equation to the form of (1). In this case, the further assumption that our filtration is quasi-left continuous, and hence the martingales considered have continuous predictable quadratic variations, allows reduction to the case considered in [12].

We shall present a sequence of results (Theorems 5.1, 6.1 and 6.2) demonstrating conditions under which there exists a unique solution to such an equation. The key distinction in these results is the assumptions on the measure μ, which are increasing in generality. Theorem 6.2 places no restrictions on μ, apart from its being a signed Stieltjes measure.

Remark 3.2. While our existence and uniqueness results apply to the case where μ is a signed measure, our main focus shall be on the case where μ is a nonnegative (unsigned) measure. For this reason, we shall assume that μ is nonnegative unless otherwise stated.

4 Inequalities for Stieltjes integrals

To give conditions under which solutions to a BSDE exist, we must first establish the following results regarding integrals with respect to Stieltjes measures. These results are standard whenever the measures are continuous.

4.1 Stieltjes Exponentials

Definition 4.1. *For any càdlàg function of finite variation* $\nu : [0, \infty[\to \mathbb{R}$*, we write*

$$\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t) := e^{\nu_t} \prod_{0 \leq s \leq t} (1 + \Delta\nu_s) e^{-\Delta\nu_s},$$

and call this the Stieltjes exponential *of* ν*. Note that this is also a càdlàg function.*

Note that $\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t)$ should be more properly written as $\mathfrak{E}(\nu_{(\cdot)}; t)$, as it is a function of $\{\nu_s; s \leq t\}$ not just of ν_t. We use the former notation purely for compactness, whenever this does not lead to confusion. We note the following useful bound.

Lemma 4.1. *If* ν *is a càdlàg function, then* $\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t) \leq e^{\nu_t}$*, where* e^{ν_t} *is the classical exponential of* ν_t*.*

Proof. As $e^x \geq 1 + x$, it is clear that $(1 + \Delta\nu_t)e^{-\Delta\nu_t} \leq 1$ for all t. The result follows. □

Lemma 4.2. *For any càdlàg function of finite variation, the Stieltjes exponential is well defined. Furthermore, if* $\Delta\nu_t \geq -1$*, then* $\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t) \geq 0$*. If* $\Delta\nu_s > -1$*, then* $\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t) > 0$*, and* $\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t)^{-1}$ *is well defined. In this case, the process* $u_t = u_s\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t)\mathfrak{E}(\nu_s)^{-1}$ *is the solution to the Lebesgue-Stieltjes integral equation*

$$u_t = u_s + \int_{]s,t]} u_{r-} d\nu_r.$$

Proof. As the process ν_t is càdlàg and of finite variation, it is a (deterministic) semimartingale. $\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t)$ is then the standard Doléans-Dade exponential of this process, and so its existence and basic properties can be seen in [13, Thm 13.5 ff]. This guarantees the convergence of the infinite products considered, and that this solves the desired integral equation. The nonnegativity result is clear by inspection.

For the positivity result, we need only show that $\prod_{0 \leq s \leq t}(1 + \Delta\nu_s) > 0$. By continuity of the logarithm, this is equivalent to showing that

$$-\sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} \log(1 + \Delta\nu_s) < \infty.$$

We then note that we can consider three cases. First, if $\Delta\nu_s \geq 0$, then $-\log(1+\Delta\nu_s) \leq 0$, and hence

$$-\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s\geq 0\}} \log(1+\Delta\nu_s) \leq 0 < \infty.$$

Second, we note that $\sum_{0<s\leq t} |\Delta\nu_s|$ is finite, as ν is of finite variation, and hence there are only finitely many s such that $\Delta\nu_s \leq -0.7$. Therefore

$$-\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s\leq -0.7\}} \log(1+\Delta\nu_s) < \infty.$$

Finally, we know that $2x < \log(1+x) < 0$ for $-0.7 < x < 0$. Hence, we have

$$-\left(\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{-0.7<\Delta\nu_s<0\}} \log(1+\Delta\nu_s)\right) < \left(\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{-0.7<\Delta\nu_s<0\}} 2|\Delta\nu_s|\right) < \infty.$$

Combining these three sums gives the desired constraint on the logarithm, and hence the strict positivity of the desired product. □

Lemma 4.3. *For ν a càdlàg function of finite variation with $\Delta\nu_t > -1$, we have the stronger result*

$$\inf_{0\leq t\leq T}\left\{\prod_{0\leq s\leq t}(1+\Delta\nu_s)\right\} > 0.$$

Proof. By the same argument as in Lemma 4.2, we have

$$-\left(\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq T\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s<0\}} \log(1+\Delta\nu_s)\right) < \infty.$$

It follows that

$$-\sum_{0\leq s\leq t} \log(1+\Delta\nu_s) < -\left(\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq T\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s<0\}} \log(1+\Delta\nu_s)\right) < \infty$$

for all t. Hence

$$\inf_{0\leq t\leq T}\left\{\prod_{0\leq s\leq t}(1+\Delta\nu_s)\right\} > \left(\prod_{\{0\leq s\leq T\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s<0\}}(1+\Delta\nu_s)\right) > 0.$$

□

Definition 4.2. *Let ν be a càdlàg function of finite variation with $\Delta\nu_t > -1$ for all t. Then the* left-jump-inversion *of ν is defined by*

$$\bar{\nu}_t = \nu_t - \sum_{0\leq s\leq t}\frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1+\Delta\nu_s}.$$

Similarly if $\Delta\nu_t < 1$ *for all* t*, the* right-jump-inversion *is defined by*

$$\tilde{\nu}_t = \nu_t + \sum_{0\leq s\leq t} \frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1-\Delta\nu_s}.$$

Lemma 4.4. *For* ν *a function as in Definition 4.2, the left- and right-jump-inversions are finite, (whenever they are defined), and satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t)^{-1} = \mathfrak{E}(-\bar{\nu}_t)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{E}(-\nu_t) = \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)^{-1}.$$

Proof. Consider first the left-jump-inversion. We know that $\Delta\nu_s > -1$ and $\sum|\Delta\nu_s| < \infty$. Hence it follows that $\Delta\nu_s$ has only finitely many values in any neigbourhood not containing zero, and hence, is bounded away from -1. That is, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\Delta\nu_s > \epsilon - 1$ for all s. To show finiteness, write

$$\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s\geq 0\}} \frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1+\Delta\nu_s} \leq \sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s\geq 0\}} |\Delta\nu_s| < \infty$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s<0\}} \frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1+\Delta\nu_s} &\leq \epsilon^{-1}\left(\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s<0\}} (\Delta\nu_s)^2\right) \\ &< \epsilon^{-1}\left(\sum_{\{0\leq s\leq t\}\cap\{\Delta\nu_s<0\}} |\Delta\nu_s|\right) \\ &< \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Combining these sums gives the desired finiteness result.

We now note that, algebraically,

$$(1-\Delta\bar{\nu}_s)^{-1} = \left(1 - \Delta\nu_s + \frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1+\Delta\nu_s}\right)^{-1} = 1 + \Delta\nu_s.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{E}(\nu_t)^{-1} &= e^{-\nu_t}\prod_{0\leq s\leq t}(1+\Delta\nu_s)^{-1}e^{\Delta\nu_s} \\ &= e^{-\nu_t + \sum_{0<s\leq t}\left(\frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1+\Delta\nu_s}\right)}\prod_{0\leq s\leq t}(1+\Delta\nu_s)^{-1}e^{\Delta\nu_s - \frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1+\Delta\nu_s}} \\ &= e^{-\bar{\nu}_t}\prod_{0\leq s\leq t}(1-\Delta\bar{\nu}_s)e^{\Delta\bar{\nu}_s} \\ &= \mathfrak{E}(-\bar{\nu}_t).\end{aligned}$$

The proof for the right-jump-inversion follows in the same way, where finiteness is because

$$\sum_{0\leq s\leq t}\frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1-\Delta\nu_s} = \sum_{0\leq s\leq t}\frac{(-\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1+(-\Delta\nu_s)},$$

and $-\nu_s$ satsifies the requirements given above for the left-jump-inversion. The algebraic result is then that

$$(1+\Delta\tilde{\nu}_s)^{-1} = \left(1 + \Delta\nu_s + \frac{(\Delta\nu_s)^2}{1-\Delta\nu_s}\right)^{-1} = 1 - \Delta\nu_s,$$

and the result is as given. ☐

Lemma 4.5. *For ν a càdlàg function of bounded variation with $\Delta\nu_s > -1$, the right-jump-inversion of the left-jump-inversion of ν is the original function, that is*

$$\tilde{\bar{\nu}}_t = \nu_t.$$

Similarly, if $\Delta\nu_s < -1$, then $\bar{\tilde{\nu}}_t = \nu_t$.

Proof. For simplicity, we decompose ν into a discontinuous part $\nu_t^d := \sum_{0\leq s\leq t}\Delta\nu_s$ and a continuous part $\nu_t^c = \nu_t - \nu_d$. Clearly, taking either the left- or right-jump-inversion will not alter the continuous part ν^c, and so it is sufficient to show that the discontinuous parts are equal, that is, $\Delta\tilde{\bar{\nu}}_t = \Delta\bar{\tilde{\nu}}_t = \Delta\nu_t$ for all t, whenever these terms are well defined. From Definition 4.2 we have

$$\Delta\bar{\nu}_t = \frac{\Delta\nu_t}{1+\Delta\nu_t}, \qquad \Delta\tilde{\nu}_t = \frac{\Delta\nu_t}{1-\Delta\nu_t}$$

and hence

$$\Delta\tilde{\bar{\nu}}_t = \frac{\Delta\bar{\nu}_t}{1-\Delta\bar{\nu}_t} = \frac{\frac{\Delta\nu_t}{1+\Delta\nu_t}}{1-\frac{\Delta\nu_t}{1+\Delta\nu_t}} = \Delta\nu_t.$$

and similarly $\Delta\bar{\tilde{\nu}}_t = \Delta\nu_t$, as desired. ☐

4.2 Integrating Factors

It is useful to have some results relating to the solutions of equations of the form $du_t - u_{t-}d\nu_t = ...$ These are similar the the classical results on the use of integrating factors and Grönwall's inequality in the study of ordinary differential equations.

Lemma 4.6. *Let u be a semimartingale such that, for ν a (nonnegative) Stieltjes measure with $\Delta\nu_t < 1$, υ a semimartingale, u_{t-} is ν-integrable and*

$$du_t \geq -u_{t-}d\nu_t + d\upsilon_t$$

then

$$d(u_t\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)) \geq (1-\Delta\nu_t)^{-1}\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{t-})d\upsilon_t,$$

where $\tilde{\nu}$ is the right-jump-inversion of ν.

Proof. Applying the product rule for stochastic integrals, as $\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)$ is of finite variation, we have

$$\frac{d(u_t\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t))}{\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{t-})} = du_t + u_{t-}d\tilde{\nu}_t + \Delta u_t\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t.$$

For all t such that $\Delta\nu_t = 0$, $d\nu_t = d\tilde{\nu}_t$ and as $(1-\Delta\nu_t)^{-1} = 1$, the result is clear. The set of t such that $\Delta\nu_t \neq 0$ is countable, and therefore, we only need verify that the jumps of the processes considered satisfy the desired inequality (as it is only the jumps which assign positive measure to countable sets).

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta(u_t\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t))}{\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{t-})} &= \Delta u_t + u_{t-}\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t + \Delta u_t\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t \\
&= \Delta u_t(1+\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t) + u_{t-}\left(\Delta\nu_t + \frac{(\Delta\nu_t)^2}{1-\Delta\nu_t}\right) \\
&= \Delta u_t(1-\Delta\nu_t)^{-1} + u_{t-}\left(\frac{\Delta\nu_t}{1-\Delta\nu_t}\right) \\
&= (u_{t-}\Delta\nu_t + \Delta u_t)(1-\Delta\nu_t)^{-1} \\
&\geq d\upsilon_t(1-\Delta\nu_t)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Lemma 4.7 (Backward Grönwall Inequality)**.** *Let* u *be a process such that, for* ν *a nonnegative Stieltjes measure with* $\Delta\nu_t < 1$ *and* α *a* $\tilde{\nu}$*-integrable process,* u *is* ν*-integrable and*

$$u_t \leq \alpha_t + \int_{]t,T]} u_s d\nu_s,$$

then

$$u_t \leq \alpha_t + \mathfrak{E}(-\nu_t)\int_{]t,T]} \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_s)\alpha_s d\tilde{\nu}_s.$$

If $\alpha_t = \alpha$ *is constant, this simplifies to*

$$u_t \leq \alpha\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_T)\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)^{-1} = \alpha\mathfrak{E}(-\nu_t)\mathfrak{E}(-\nu_T)^{-1}.$$

Proof. First note that $d\nu_t = \frac{d\tilde{\nu}}{1+\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t}$ and that $\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t\Delta\nu_t = \Delta\tilde{\nu}_t d\nu_t$. Then let

$$w_t := \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)\int_{]t,T]} u_s d\nu_s.$$

From the product rule for Stochastic integrals, as ν is of finite variation,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dw_t}{\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{t-})} &= \left(\int_{]t,T]} u_s d\nu_s\right) d\tilde{\nu}_s - u_t d\nu_t - u_t\Delta\nu_t\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t \\
&= -u_t(1+\Delta\tilde{\nu}_t)d\nu_t + \left(\int_{]t,T]} u_s d\nu_s\right) d\tilde{\nu}_t \\
&= -u_t d\tilde{\nu}_t + \left(\int_{]t,T]} u_s d\nu_s\right) d\tilde{\nu}_t \\
&= \left(-u_t + \int_{]t,T]} u_s d\nu_s\right) d\tilde{\nu}_t \\
&\geq -\alpha_t d\tilde{\nu}_t.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $d\tilde{\nu}_t$ and $\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{t-})$ are both nonnegative. Therefore, by integration,

$$w_t = \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)\int_{]t,T]} u_s d\nu_s \leq \int_{]t,T]} \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{s-})\alpha_s d\tilde{\nu}_s.$$

Substitution yields

$$u_{t-} \leq \alpha_t + \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)^{-1} \int_{]t,T]} \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{s-}) \alpha_s d\tilde{\nu}_s$$

and the desired inequalities follow from $\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)^{-1} = \mathfrak{E}(-\nu_t)$. If $\alpha_t = \alpha$, then this simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} u_{t-} &\leq \alpha \left[1 + \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)^{-1} \int_{]t,T]} \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_{s-}) d\tilde{\nu}_s \right] \\ &= \alpha \left[1 + \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)^{-1} (\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_T) - \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)) \right] \\ &= \alpha \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_T) \mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\nu}_t)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.8 (Forward Grönwall Inequality)**.** *Let u be a function such that, for ν a nonnegative Stieltjes measure and α a $\bar{\nu}$-integrable process, u is ν-integrable and*

$$u_t \leq \alpha_t + \int_{]0,t]} u_s d\nu_s,$$

then

$$u_t \leq \alpha_t + \mathfrak{E}(\nu_t) \int_{]0,t]} \mathfrak{E}(-\bar{\nu}_s) \alpha_s d\bar{\nu}_s.$$

If $\alpha_t = \alpha$ is constant, this simplifies to

$$u_t \leq \alpha \mathfrak{E}(\nu_t).$$

Proof. This result follows in an almost identical fashion to Lemma 4.7, and the proof is therefore omitted. □

5 Existence of BSDE solutions – fundamental results

In this section we shall establish the existence of solutions to BSDEs when the process μ satisfies particular properties.

Definition 5.1. *We consider a (deterministic) nondecreasing right-continuous function $\mu : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that μ is the distribution function of a measure on $[0,T]$, and $\langle M^1 \rangle_t$, the predictable quadratic variation of the first martingale of Theorem 2.1, is absolutely continuous with respect to μ, except possibly on some $\mathbb{P}$-null set.*

As μ is of finite variation, its discontinuities $\Delta\mu$ are bounded. We assume that $\mu_T \leq 1$ and that μ assigns positive measure to any nonempty open interval in $[0,T]$.

We note that such a deterministic function must exist, an example would be

$$\mu_t = \frac{E[\langle M^1 \rangle_t] + t}{E[\langle M^1 \rangle_T] + T}.$$

Because $\mu \succ \langle M^1\rangle \succ \langle M^2\rangle \succ \dots$ as measures on $\Omega \times [0,T]$, there exists a well defined random process $\psi^i(\omega,t) = d\langle M^i\rangle/d\mu$, the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\langle M^i\rangle$ with respect to μ.

The measure μ will serve in the place of the Lebesgue measure dt in our BSDE. Unless otherwise indicated, all (in-)equalities should be read as 'up to evanescence'.

Definition 5.2. *We denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the standard Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^K$, and note that $\|y\|^2 = y^*y$, where $[\cdot]^*$ denotes vector transposition.*

Definition 5.3. *For a given μ and fixed $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the stochastic seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{M_t}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$ by the equation*

$$\|z_t\|^2_{M_t} = \sum_i \left[\|z^i_t\|^2 \psi^i_t\right]$$

where $\psi^i_t := d\langle M^i\rangle/d\mu$ and $z^i_t \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is the i'th element in Z_t, considered as a series of values in $\mathbb{R}^K$.

We note that, for any predictable, $d\mu \times d\mathbb{P}$ progressively measurable process Z taking values in $\mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$, and in particular for processes satisfying (2) in each of their K components, the stochastic integral is constructed using the isometry

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\int_A \|Z_t\|^2_{M_t} d\mu\right] &= E\left[\sum_i \int_A \|Z^i_t\|^2 d\langle M^i_t\rangle\right] \\ = E\left[\sum_i \left\|\int_A Z^i_t dM^i_t\right\|^2\right] &= E\left[\left\|\sum_i \int_A Z^i_t dM^i_t\right\|^2\right] \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

for any interval $A \subseteq]0,T]$. (Note this requires the orthogonality of the M^i.)

Definition 5.4. *We define the following spaces of equivalence classes*

$$\begin{aligned} H^2_M &= \left\{Z : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty};\quad \textit{predictable, } E\left[\int_{[0,T]} \|Z_u\|^2_{M_u} d\mu_u\right] < +\infty\right\}, \\ S^2 &= \left\{Y : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^K;\quad E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|Y_t\|^2\right] < +\infty\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where two elements $Z, \bar{Z}$ of H^2_M are deemed equivalent if

$$E\left[\int_{[0,T]} \|Z_u - \bar{Z}_u\|^2_{M_u} d\mu_u\right] = 0,$$

and two elements of S^2 are deemed equivalent if they are indistinguishable. Note that K is here taken as fixed.

Remark 5.1. We note that H^2_M is itself a complete metric space, with norm given by $Z \mapsto E\left[\int_{]0,T]} \|Z_t\|^2_{M_t} d\mu_t\right]$.

Remark 5.2. We note that, by the isometry (4), H^2_M is independent of the choice of μ.

Lemma 5.1. *The martingale representations constructed in Theorem 2.1 are unique in* H^2_M.

Proof. This is true by the linearity of the integral, and the stated isometry (4), as the difference of any two representations will be zero in the norm of H^2_M. ☐

Remark 5.3. By Definition 5.3 and the stated isometry (4), $Z \in H^2_M$ if and only if (2) holds.

A key assumption in the study of BSDEs is the continuity of the driver function F. When the predictable quadratic covariations of all martingales in our space are continuous, we shall show that it is sufficient that F is uniformly Lipschitz continuous for the BSDE (3) to have a solution. On the other hand, as is clear in discrete time (cf [5]), when the predictable quadratic covariations are not continuous, a stronger condition is needed on F. We shall call this a *firm* Lipschitz bound on F, as is defined in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *For* μ *as in Definition 5.1, let* $F : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty} \to \mathbb{R}^K$ *be a predictable,* $d\mu \times d\mathbb{P}$ *progressively measurable function such that*

- $E\left[\int_{]0,T]} \|F(\omega,t,0,0)\|^2 d\mu\right] < +\infty$
- *There exists a (linear) firm Lipschitz bound on* F*, that is, a measurable (deterministic) function* c_t *uniformly bounded by some* $c \in \mathbb{R}$*, such that, for any* $y_t, y'_t \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $z_t, z'_t \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$,

  $$\|F(\omega,t,y_t,z_t)-F(\omega,t,y'_t,z'_t)\|^2 \leq c_t\|y_t-y'_t\|^2+c\|z_t-z'_t\|^2_{M_t} \qquad d\mu\times d\mathbb{P}-a.s.$$

  and

  $$c_t\Delta\mu_t < 1.$$

  Note that the variable bound c_t *need only apply to the behaviour of* F *with respect to* y.

A function satisfying these conditions will be called standard. *Then for any* $Q \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^K;\mathcal{F}_T)$*, the BSDE (3) with driver* F *has a unique solution* $(Y,Z) \in S^2 \times H^2_M$*. (*$S^2$ *and* H^2_M *are defined in Definition 5.4.)*

To prove this theorem, we first establish the following results.

Lemma 5.2. *Let* (Y,Z) *be the solution to a BSDE with data* (F,Q)*. If* F *is standard,* $Q \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^K;\mathcal{F}_T)$ *and* $Z \in H^2_M$*, then* $Y \in S^2$ *if and only if*

$$\int_{]0,T]} E[\|Y_{t-}\|^2]d\mu < +\infty. \tag{5}$$

Proof. Clearly, if $Y \in S^2$, then (5) holds. For the converse, write

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|Y_t\|^2 \leq 2\|Q\|^2 &+ 4\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left\|\sum_i \int_{]t,T]} Z^i_u dM^i_u\right\|^2 \\
&+ 4\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left\{\int_{]t,T]}\|F(\omega,u,Y_{u-},Z_u)\|^2 d\mu\right\}. \\
\leq 2\|Q\|^2 &+ 4\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left\|\sum_i \int_{]t,T]} Z^i_u dM^i_u\right\|^2 \\
&+ 8\int_{]0,T]}\|F(\omega,u,0,0)\|^2 d\mu + 8\int_{]0,T]} c_t\|Y_{u-}\|^2 + c\|Z_u\|^2_{M_u} d\mu
\end{aligned}$$

and by the assumptions of the lemma, as $Z \in H^2_M$ and so $\sum_i \int_{]0,t]} Z^i_u dM^i_u$ is a square integrable martingale, by Doob's inequality [15, Thm 1.43], this quantity is finite in expectation. ☐

Lemma 5.3. *Let (Y, Z) and $(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z})$ be the solutions to two BSDEs with standard parameters (F, Q) and $(\bar{F}, \bar{Q})$. If*

$$\delta_2 f_t := F(\omega, t, \bar{Y}_{t-}, \bar{Z}_t) - \bar{F}(\omega, t, \bar{Y}_{t-}, \bar{Z}_t),$$

then for any nonnegative measurable functions x_t, w_t, with $\Delta\mu_t \le x_t^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} dE[\|Y_t - \bar{Y}_t\|^2] \ge & -[(x_t^{-1} - \Delta\mu_t)(1 + w_t)c_t + x_t]E[\|Y_{t-} - \bar{Y}_{t-}\|^2]d\mu_t \\ & + [1 - (x_t^{-1} - \Delta\mu_t)(1 + w_t)c]E[\|Z_t - \bar{Z}_t\|^2_{M_t}]d\mu_t \\ & - [(x_t^{-1} - \Delta\mu_t)(1 + w_t^{-1})]E[\|\delta_2 f_t\|^2]d\mu_t. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\delta Y = Y - \bar{Y}$, and similarly for F and Z. By application of the differentiation rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d[\|\delta Y_t\|^2] = & -2(\delta Y_{t-})^*(\delta F_t)d\mu_t + 2\sum_i (\delta Y_{t-})^*(\delta Z^i_t)dM^i_t \\ & + \sum_{i,j} (\delta Z^i_t)^*(\delta Z^j_t)d[M^i, M^j]_t + \|\delta F_t\|^2(\Delta\mu_t)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

As $Y \in S^2$, it is clear that $\int_{]0,t]} \sum_i (\delta Y_{s-})^*(\delta Z^i_s)dM^i_s$ is a martingale. Also, $\delta Z \in H^2_M$ and so, by orthogonality of the M^i,

$$\sum_{i,j} (\delta Z^i_t)^*(\delta Z^j_t)d[M^i, M^j]_t - \sum_i \|\delta Z^i_t\|^2 d\langle M^i\rangle_t$$

is a martingale. Taking an expectation through (6) and applying Fubini's theorem then yields

$$\begin{aligned} dE[\|\delta Y_t\|^2] &= -2E[(\delta Y_{t-})^*(\delta F_t)]d\mu_t + E\left[\sum_i \|\delta Z^i_t\|^2 d\langle M^i\rangle_t\right] + E[\|\delta F_t\|^2](\Delta\mu_t)^2 \\ &= -2E[(\delta Y_{t-})^*(\delta F_t)]d\mu_t + E[\|\delta Z\|^2_{M_t}]d\mu_t + E[\|\delta F_t\|^2](\Delta\mu_t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $(\Delta\mu_t)^2 = (\Delta\mu_t)(d\mu_t)$ and that for any $x \ge 0$, any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\pm 2ab \le xa^2 + x^{-1}b^2$, we have, for any measurable function $x_t \ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} dE[\|\delta Y_t\|^2] \ge & -x_t E[\|\delta Y_{t-}\|^2]d\mu_t - x_t^{-1}E[\|\delta F_t\|^2]d\mu_t \\ & + E[\|\delta Z_t\|^2_{M_t}]d\mu_t + E[\|\delta F_t\|^2](\Delta\mu_t)^2 \\ = & -x_t E[\|\delta Y_{t-}\|^2]d\mu_t + (\Delta\mu_t - x_t^{-1})E[\|\delta F_t\|^2]d\mu_t + E[\|\delta Z_t\|^2_{M_t}]d\mu_t. \end{aligned}$$

We now note that, for any measurable $w_t \ge 0$, as $(a+b)^2 \le (1+w)a^2 + (1+w^{-1})b^2$ for all $w \ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta F_t\|^2 \le & (1 + w_t)\|F(\omega, t, Y_{t-}, Z_t) - F(\omega, t, \bar{Y}_{t-}, \bar{Z}_t)\|^2 \\ & + (1 + w_t^{-1})\|F(\omega, t, \bar{Y}_{t-}, \bar{Z}_t) - \bar{F}(\omega, t, \bar{Y}_{t-}, \bar{Z}_t)\|^2 \\ \le & (1 + w_t)c_t\|\delta Y_{t-}\|^2 + (1 + w_t)c\|\delta Z_t\|^2_{M_t} + (1 + w_t^{-1})\|\delta_2 f_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Provided $\Delta\mu_t - x_t^{-1} \le 0$, combining this with the previous inequality gives the desired result. ☐

Lemma 5.4. *Let $F : \Omega \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^K$ be a predictable progressively measurable function such that*

$$E\left[\int_{[0,T]} \|F(\omega,t)\|^2 d\mu\right] < +\infty.$$

Then the BSDE

$$Y_t - \int_{]t,T]} F(\omega,u)d\mu + \sum_i \int_{]t,T]} Z_u^i dM_u^i = Q$$

has a unique solution in $S^2 \times H_M^2$ for any $Q \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^K;\mathcal{F}_T)$. (Note here that F does not depend on Y or Z.)

Proof. Using Theorem 2.1, we first construct processes Z^i which give a representation of the square integrable martingale

$$\sum_i \int_{]0,t]} Z_u^i dM_u^i = E\left[Q + \int_{]0,T]} F(\omega,u)d\mu \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right].$$

This can clearly be done componentwise, and so we obtain a unique process $Z \in H_M^2$, i.e. $Z_s(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^K$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i \int_{]t,T]} Z_u^i dM_u^i &= Q + \int_{]0,T]} F(\omega,u)d\mu - E\left[Q + \int_{]0,T]} F(\omega,u)d\mu \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right]\\ &= Q + \int_{]t,T]} F(\omega,u)d\mu - E\left[Q + \int_{]t,T]} F(\omega,u)d\mu \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right]\end{aligned}$$

and so there is a process

$$Y_t := E\left[Q + \int_{]t,T]} F(\omega,u)d\mu \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right].$$

which satisfies the BSDE. By the uniqueness and right-continuity of the conditional expectation, this process is unique up to indistinguishability and hence in S^2. ☐

Proof of Theorem 5.1. For x, w as in Lemma 5.3, let

$$\begin{aligned}\upsilon_t &= \int_{]0,t]} [(x_s^{-1} - \Delta\mu_s)(1+w_s)c_s + x_s]d\mu_s\\ \pi_t &= \int_{]0,t]} [(x_s^{-1} - \Delta\mu_s)(1+w_s^{-1})](1-\Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1}d\mu_s\\ \rho_t &= \int_{]0,t]} [1 - (x_s^{-1} - \Delta\mu_s)(1+w_t)c](1-\Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1}d\mu_s.\end{aligned}$$

Then we have that

$$dE[\|\delta Y_t\|^2] \geq -E[\|\delta Y_{t-}\|^2]d\upsilon_t + E[\|\delta Z_t\|_{M_t}^2](1-\Delta\upsilon_t)d\rho_t - E[\|\delta_2 f_t\|^2](1-\Delta\upsilon_s)d\pi_t.$$

Hence, provided υ is of finite variation, $\Delta\upsilon_t < 1$ and $\Delta\mu - x^{-1} \leq 0$, an application of Lemma 4.6 yields

$$d[E[\|\delta Y_t\|^2\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_t)] \geq \left(E[\|\delta Z_t\|_{M_t}^2]d\rho_t - E[\|\delta_2 f_t\|^2]d\pi_t\right)\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{t-}).$$

By integration, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}E[\|\delta Y_t\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_t) + \int_{]t,T]} E[\|\delta Z_s\|^2_{M_s}]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})d\rho_s \\ \leq E[\|\delta Q\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_T) + \int_{]t,T]} E[\|\delta_2 f_s\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})d\pi_s\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Taking a left-limit in t gives, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}E[\|\delta Y_{t-}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{t-}) + \int_{[t,T]} E[\|\delta Z_s\|^2_{M_s}]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})d\rho_s \\ \leq E[\|\delta Q\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_T) + \int_{[t,T]} E[\|\delta_2 f_s\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})d\pi_s\end{aligned}$$

and so by integration and Fubini's theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{]0,T]} E[\|\delta Y_{t-}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{t-})d\mu_t + \int_{]0,T]} \mu_s E[\|\delta Z_s\|^2_{M_s}]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})d\rho_s \\ \leq \mu_T E[\|\delta Q\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_T) + \int_{]0,T]} \mu_s E[\|\delta_2 f_s\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})d\pi_s.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We now consider constructing a sequence of approximations in the usual way. For a BSDE with driver F and terminal condition Q, we fix an initial approximation $(Y^0, Z^0) \in S^2 \times H^2_M$. We shall first allow the Z component of the solution to converge, then allow the Y component to do likewise. This two-stage approach is needed due to the difference in the Lipschitz coefficients of F with respect to Y and Z.

To construct the Z solutions, for any approximation Z^n, we fix the driver $F(\cdot, \cdot, Y^0, Z^n)$. Using Lemma 5.4, we obtain a new approximation (Y^{n+1}, Z^{n+1}). This defines a sequence of approximations of solutions to the equation with driver $F(\cdot, \cdot, Y^0, \cdot)$. Note that the driver at each iteration is Lipschitz continuous, with Lipschitz coefficients of zero.

Consider the difference $(\delta Y^{n+1}, \delta Z^{n+1})$ of two BSDE solutions from the approximation method, with the same terminal condition (i.e. $\delta Q = 0$) and the same driver F. These come from a driver with $c = 0$, and so $d\rho_t = (1 - \Delta\upsilon_t)^{-1}d\mu_t = (1 - x_t\Delta\mu_t)^{-1}d\mu_t$ in this case. From our above estimates (7), we obtain, for any functions $x_t^{-1} > \Delta\mu_t$, $w_t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{]t,T]} E[\|\delta Z^{n+1}_s\|^2_{M_s}]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})(1 - \Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1}d\mu_s \\ \leq \int_{]t,T]} E[\|\delta_2 f_s\|^2][(x_s^{-1} - \Delta\mu_s)(1 + w_s^{-1})]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})(1 - \Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1}d\mu_s.\end{aligned}$$

By the Lipschitz continuity of the original driver, we have

$$E[\|\delta_2 f_s\|^2] \leq cE[\|\delta Z^n_s\|^2_{M_t}]$$

and so, if $w_t = 1, x_t^{-1} = \frac{1}{4c} + \Delta\mu_t$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{]0,T]} E[\|\delta Z^{n+1}_s\|^2_{M_s}]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})(1 - \Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1}d\mu_s \\ \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_{]0,T]} E[\|\delta Z^n_s\|^2_{M_t}]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})(1 - \Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1}d\mu_s.\end{aligned}$$

With these values of x_t and w_t, we can see that $\Delta\mu_t - x_t^{-1} \leq 0$, and furthermore, as our modified driver has Lipshitz coefficients of zero at each iteration,

$$\upsilon_t = \int_{]0,t]} x_s d\mu_s = \int_{]0,t]} \frac{4c}{1+4c\Delta\mu_s} d\mu_s \leq 4c\mu_t$$

is nondecreasing and bounded (and hence of finite variation), and

$$\Delta\upsilon_t = \frac{4c\Delta\mu_t}{1+4c\Delta\mu_t} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{1+4c} < 1.$$

It follows that our estimate (7) holds, and $\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})(1-\Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1}$ is strictly positive and bounded. Hence

$$Z \mapsto \int_{]0,T]} E[\|Z_s\|^2_{M_t}]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})(1-\Delta\upsilon_s)^{-1} d\mu_s$$

is an equivalent norm on H^2_M, and so, by completeness, the contraction mapping principle gives the existence of a unique limit $Z \in H^2_M$ solving the BSDE with driver $F(\cdot,\cdot,Y^0,\cdot)$ and terminal value Q.

We now construct a convergent sequence of approximations in Y. For any terminal value Q, consider an approximation $Y^n \in S^2$. We can then construct a solution (Y^{n+1}, Z^{n+1}) to the BSDE with driver $F(\cdot,\cdot,Y^n,\cdot)$, using the above result. This modified driver can be thought of as Lipschitz continuous with coefficients $c > c_t = 0$. Considering the difference of any two approximations δY^n, by the Lipschitz continuity of the original driver, we have

$$E[\|\delta_2 f_s\|^2] \leq c_t E[\|\delta Y^n_{s-}\|^2]$$

and so, provided ρ is a nonnegative measure, our above estimates (8) give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{]0,T]} E[\|\delta Y^{n+1}_{t-}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{t-}) d\mu_t \\
&\quad \leq \int_{]0,T]} \mu_s E[\|\delta_2 f_s\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-}) d\pi_s \\
&\quad \leq \int_{]0,T]} E[\|\delta Y^n_{s-}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{\upsilon}_{s-})\mu_s c_s[(x_s^{-1} - \Delta\mu_s)(1+w_s^{-1})](1 - x_s\Delta\mu_s)^{-1} d\mu_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the Lipchitz bounds of the original driver F. Without loss of generality, we assume that $c_s > 0$ uniformly. Next note that as $c_s\Delta\mu_s < 1$ and c_s is bounded by c, it must be the case that $c_s\Delta\mu_s$ is uniformly bounded away from one. Hence, there exists a fixed $\epsilon > 0$ such that $c_s\Delta\mu_s < 1 - \epsilon$.

Now, we let

$$\begin{aligned}
x_t &= \frac{c(1+2\epsilon^{-1})}{1 + c(1+2\epsilon^{-1})\Delta\mu_t} \\
w_t &= 3\epsilon^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

As

$$x_t^{-1} - \Delta\mu_t = \frac{1}{c(1+2\epsilon^{-1})} < \frac{1}{c(1+w_t)}$$

it is clear that

$$d\rho_t = [1 - (x_t^{-1} - \Delta\mu_t)(1 + w_t)c](1 - x_t\Delta\mu_t)^{-1} d\mu_t > 0$$

so ρ is a nonnegative measure, as required. Also, as $c_t = 0$ for our modified driver, for these values of x_t and w_t, we can again easily verify that the resulting v is nonnegative, bounded and $\Delta v < 1$. It follows that $\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_s)$ is strictly positive and bounded.

By construction, and the fact $\mu_s \leq \mu_T \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_s c_s[(x_s^{-1} - \Delta\mu_s)(1 + w_s^{-1})](1 - x_s\Delta\mu_s)^{-1} \\
&\quad = \mu_s c_s x_s^{-1}(1 + w_s^{-1}) \\
&\quad = \mu_s c_s \left(\frac{1}{c(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1})} + \Delta\mu_s\right)(1 + w_s^{-1}) \\
&\quad \leq \mu_s \left(\frac{c_s}{c(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1})} + 1 - \epsilon\right)\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) \\
&\quad \leq \mu_s \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \leq 1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}
\end{aligned}$$

where the fifth line is because

$$\frac{c_s}{c} \leq 1 < 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \frac{\epsilon}{2}(1 + 2\epsilon^{-1}).$$

We then have

$$\int_{]0,T]} E[\|\delta Y_{t-}^{n+1}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_{t-})d\mu_t \leq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}\right)\int_{]0,T]} E[\|\delta Y_{s-}^{n}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_{s-})d\mu_s.$$

As $\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_{s-})$ is strictly positive and bounded,

$$Y \mapsto \int_{]0,T]} E[\|Y_{s-}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_{s-})d\mu_s$$

is an equivalent norm on the space of processes satisfying (5) and so, by completeness, the contraction mapping principle gives the existence of a limit Y solving the BSDE with driver F and terminal value Q. This limit is unique, that is, if $Y, \bar{Y}$ are two solutions, then

$$\int_{]0,T]} E[\|Y_{s-} - \bar{Y}_{s-}\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_{s-})d\mu_s = 0.$$

As $Y_{s-} - \bar{Y}_{s-}$ is left continuous, if $\|Y_{s-} - \bar{Y}_{s-}\|^2 > 0$ for some s, then it is positive on some nonempty open interval. As μ assigns positive measure to every nonempty open interval, by contradiction, we must have $Y_{s-} = \bar{Y}_{s-}$ for all s. Again by left continuity, it follows that Y and $\bar{Y}$ are indistinguishable, that is, Y is unique in S^2.

The existence of Z also follows from (8), as ρ is strictly positive and hence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{]t,T]} \mu_s E[\|\delta Z_s^n\|_{M_s}^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_{s-})d\rho_s \leq \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{]0,T]} \mu_s E[\|\delta_2 f_s^n\|^2]\mathfrak{E}(\tilde{v}_{s-})d\pi_s = 0,$$

that is, δZ^n also converges to zero. Uniqueness of Z follows from the above results with Y fixed at the solution of the BSDE. □

Remark 5.4. In discrete time, we have shown in [7] that a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a solution to the discrete BSDE is that F is invariant with respect to Z in $\|\cdot\|_{M_t}$ and that $y \to y - F(\omega, t, y, z)$ is a bijection in y for all z, t and almost all ω. The requirement that F is firmly Lipschitz is sufficient, but not necessary, to guarantee that these conditions hold.

6 Existence of BSDE Solutions – General Results

We now wish to extend our above solution to allow μ to be any Stieltjes measure. This shall be done in two stages, first by relaxing the condition that $\mu_T \leq 1$, and then relaxing the conditions that $E[\langle M^1\rangle_t]$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ and that μ assigns positive measure to every open interval.

Definition 6.1. *For two measures ν, μ, we shall write $\nu \sim \mu$ when the measures are equivalent.*

Theorem 6.1. *Let μ be any deterministic Stieltjes measure assigning positive measure to every open interval, and such that $\mu \succ \langle M^1\rangle_t$. (Note $\|\cdot\|_M$ is still well defined in relation to μ.) Let $F : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty} \to \mathbb{R}^K$ be a predictable, $d\mu \times d\mathbb{P}$ progressively measurable function such that*

- $E\left[\int_{]0,T]} \|F(\omega, t, 0, 0)\|^2 d\mu\right] < +\infty$
- *There exists a (quadratic) firm Lipschitz bound on F, that is, a measurable (deterministic) function c_t uniformly bounded by some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, such that, for any $y_t, y'_t \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $z_t, z'_t \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$,*

  $$\|F(\omega,t,y_t,z_t)-F(\omega,t,y'_t,z'_t)\|^2 \leq c_t\|y_t-y'_t\|^2+c\|z_t-z'_t\|^2_{M_t} \qquad d\mu\times d\mathbb{P}-a.s.$$

  and

  $$c_t(\Delta\mu_t)^2 < 1.$$

  Note that the variable bound c_t need only apply to the behaviour of F with respect to y.

A function satisfying these conditions will be called standard. *Then for any $Q \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^K; \mathcal{F}_T)$, the BSDE (3) with driver F has a unique solution $(Y, Z) \in S^2 \times H^2_M$. ($S^2$ and H^2_M are defined in Definition 5.4.)*

Proof. As μ_T is finite, the jumps of μ are bounded above. It follows that we can assume, without loss of generality, that $c_t > 0$ uniformly and $c > 1$, and there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $c_t(\Delta\mu_t)^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$. Let

$$\nu_t = \int_{]0,t]} \frac{2(1+\epsilon^{-1})c}{\epsilon + 2(1+\epsilon^{-1})c\Delta\mu_t} d\mu_t =: \int_{]0,t]} \lambda_t^{-1} d\mu_t$$

Then $\nu \sim \mu$, and $\Delta\nu_t = \lambda_t^{-1}\Delta\mu_t < 1$. As ν_t is right continuous, deterministic, and has no jumps of size equal to or greater than one, there exists an $\eta > 0$ and a finite sequence $\{t_0, t_1, ..., t_B\}$ such that $t_0 = 0$, $t_B = T$ and $\nu(]t_i, t_{i+1}]) \leq 1 - \eta$ for all i.

We now note that, omitting the ω and t arguments, our BSDE (3) can be written

$$Q = Y_t - \int_{]t,T]} \lambda_u F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) d\nu_u + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{]t,T]} Z_u^i dM_u^i \tag{9}$$

which is a BSDE with Lipschitz property

$$\|\lambda_t F(y_t, z_t) - \lambda_t F(y'_t, z'_t)\|^2 \leq \lambda_t^2 c_t \|y_t - y'_t\|^2 + \lambda_t^2 c \|z_t - z'_t\|^2_{M_t} \qquad d\nu \times d\mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

We write

$$\bar{c} = \sup_t \{\lambda_t^2 c\} \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon^{-1})c} + \mu_T\right)^2 c < \infty$$

and $\bar{c}_t = \lambda_t^2 c_t$. Note that as $\epsilon < 1$, $c_t/c < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{c}_t \Delta\nu_t &= \left(\frac{\epsilon^2 + 2(1+\epsilon^{-1})c\Delta\mu_t}{2(1+\epsilon^{-1})c}\right)^2 c_t \Delta\nu_t \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon^{-1})c} + \Delta\mu_t\right)^2 c_t \\
&\leq (1+\epsilon^{-1}) \frac{\epsilon^2 c_t}{4(1+\epsilon^{-1})^2 c^2} + (1+\epsilon) c_t (\Delta\mu_t)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} + (1+\epsilon)(1-\epsilon) \\
&\leq 1 - \frac{3\epsilon^2}{4} \\
&< 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we define the measures

$$\nu_t^k = \int_{]0, t\wedge t_{k+1}]} \left(\frac{\eta}{\nu_{t_k}} + \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\nu_{t_k}}\right) I_{t > t_k}\right) d\nu_t.$$

It is easy then to show that $\nu_t^k \leq 1$ for all k, ν^k assigns positive measure to every interval in $]0, t_{k+1}]$, and $\nu^k \succ E[\langle M^1 \rangle]$ on $]0, t_{k+1}]$. Hence ν^k is a measure of the type considered in Theorem 5.1. Also, $\Delta\nu_t^k \leq \Delta\nu_t < 1$ and ν^k agrees with ν for all subsets of $]t_k, t_{k+1}]$.

We now consider the sequence of BSDEs

$$Y_{t_{k+1}}^{k+1} = Y_t^k - \int_{]t,t_{k+1}]} \lambda_t F(Y_{u-}^k, Z_u^k) d\nu_u^k + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{]t,t_{k+1}]} (Z^k)_u^i dM_u^i \tag{10}$$

with $Y_T^B = Q$. For each k, (10) is a standard BSDE with a driver $\lambda_t F$, which has Lipshitz coefficients of $\bar{c}_t$ and $\bar{c}$, and hence is (linearly) firmly Lipschitz. Hence, the existence of a unique solution for each k is guaranteed by Theorem 5.1.

For $k = B-1$, (10) agrees with (9), and hence with the original BSDE (3), for all $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$. It follows that the solution Y_t^{B-1} is a solution to our original BSDE on the interval $[t_{B-1}, t_B]$. Similarly, for $k = B-2$, this argument then implies that Y_t^{B-2} is a solution to our original BSDE on the interval $[t_{B-2}, t_{B-1}]$, etc...

We now piece together these solutions to define $Y_t = Y_t^k$ where $t \in]t_k, t_{k+1}]$, and similarly for Z. By an inductive argument, we can see that this will solve the desired BSDE. Furthermore, this solution will be unique, as the solution is unique on each subsection $]t_k, t_{k+1}]$. ☐

Remark 6.1. We note that, when $\mu_T \leq 1$, the conditions of Theorem 6.1 are strictly weaker than those of Theorem 5.1. In this case, the jumps of μ satisfy $\Delta\mu \leq 1$ and it follows that a quadratic firm Lipschitz bound is weaker than a linear firm Lipschitz bound.

6.1 A General Existence Theorem

We now construct the solution to a BSDE where μ is an arbitrary deterministic Stieltjes measure.

Theorem 6.2. *Let μ be any deterministic signed Stieltjes measure, and let $\bar{\mu}_t = E[\langle M^1\rangle_t] + t + |\mu|_t$. Consider $F : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty} \to \mathbb{R}^K$ a predictable, $d\mu \times d\mathbb{P}$ progressively measurable function such that*

- $E\left[\int_{]0,T]} \|F(\omega,t,0,0)\|^2 d|\mu|\right] < +\infty$*, where $|\mu|$ is the total variation of μ,*
- *There exists a (quadratic) firm Lipschitz bound on F, that is, a measurable (deterministic) function c_t uniformly bounded by some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, such that, for any $y_t, y_t' \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $z_t, z_t' \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times\infty}$,*

  $$\|F(\omega,t,y_t,z_t) - F(\omega,t,y_t',z_t')\|^2 \leq c_t\|y_t - y_t'\|^2 + c\|z_t - z_t'\|^2_{M_t} \qquad d\mu \times d\mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

  where $\|\cdot\|_{M_t}$ is the seminorm generated by $\bar{\mu}_t$, and

  $$c_t(\Delta\mu_t)^2 < 1.$$

  Note that the variable bound c_t need only apply to the behaviour of F with respect to y.

A function satisfying these conditions will be called standard. *Then for any $Q \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^K; \mathcal{F}_T)$, the BSDE (3) with driver F has a unique solution $(Y, Z) \in S^2 \times H^2_M$.*

Proof. Clearly $\bar{\mu} \succ \mu$, and so we can write our BSDE as

$$Q = Y_t - \int_{]t,T]} \lambda_u F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) d\bar{\mu}_u + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{]t,T]} Z_u^i dM_u^i \tag{11}$$

where $\lambda = d\mu/d\bar{\mu}$ and hence $|\lambda| \leq 1$. Any solution to the original BSDE (3) is also a solution to the BSDE (11) and vice versa, and, therefore, the existence of a unique solution to (11) guarantees the existence of a unique solution to (3).

From the construction of $\bar{\mu}$, it is clear that (11) is a BSDE of the form considered in Theorem 6.1, with a driver $\lambda_t F$ satisfying the Lipschitz bound

$$\|\lambda_t F(y_t,z_t) - \lambda_t F(y_t',z_t')\|^2 \leq c_t\lambda_t^2\|y_t - y_t'\|^2 + c\lambda_t^2\|z_t - z_t'\|^2_{M_t} \qquad d\mu \times d\mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Furthermore,

$$c_t\lambda_t^2(\Delta\bar{\mu}_t)^2 = c_t\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\bar{\mu}}\right)^2(\Delta\bar{\mu}_t)^2 = c_t(\Delta\mu_t)^2 < 1.$$

Finally, we see that

$$E\left[\int_{]0,T]} \|\lambda_t F(\omega,t,0,0)\|^2 d\bar{\mu}\right] = E\left[\int_{]0,T]} |\lambda_t| \|F(\omega,t,0,0)\|^2 d|\mu|\right] < +\infty.$$

Therefore, the BSDE (11) satisfies the requirements of Theorem 6.1, and hence a unique solution exists in $S^2 \times H^2_M$. ☐

Remark 6.2. Clearly if $\Delta\mu = 0$, then the requirement that F is firmly Lipschitz degenerates into the classical requirement that F is uniformly Lipschitz. It is to be expected that many of the generalisations of the Lipschitz conditions which are known in the case where our filtration is generated by a Brownian motion, i.e. to drivers with a stochastic Lipschitz bound, to drivers with quadratic growth, to drivers with linear growth and a monotonicity condition, etc..., will also be possible in this situation. There is, however, considerable difficulty involved in obtaining these results in the simple continuous case, and it is to be expected that this difficulty will be increased by the discontinuities present here.

Remark 6.3. The situation where F has stochastic Lipschitz bounds is of particular interest here, as it would then be possible to consider replacing μ with a general predictable process of finite variation, and consequently, with any square integrable special semimartingale. Such a general situation is arguably as general as can be expected within the context of stochastic integration.

7 A Comparison Theorem

Given we have now established the existence of solutions to these equations, we now wish to prove a comparison theorem for them. This is based on the theorem in [8], for BSDEs of the type of (1).

Remark 7.1. While our existence and uniqueness result applies to the case where μ is a signed measure, we shall henceforth assume that μ is a nonnegative measure.

Theorem 7.1 (Comparison Theorem). *Suppose we have two BSDEs corresponding to standard coefficients and terminal values* (F,Q) *and* $(\bar{F},\bar{Q})$ *. Let* (Y,Z) *and* $(\bar{Y},\bar{Z})$ *be the associated solutions. Suppose that for some* s*, the following conditions hold:*

(i) $Q \geq \bar{Q}$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s.*

(ii) $\mu \times \mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* $[s,T] \times \Omega$*,*

$$F(\omega,u,\bar{Y}_{u-},\bar{Z}_u) \geq \bar{F}(\omega,u,\bar{Y}_{u-},\bar{Z}_u).$$

(iii) For each j*, there exists a measure* $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$ *equivalent to* $\mathbb{P}$ *such that the* j*th component of* X*, as defined for* $r \geq s$ *by*

$$\begin{aligned} e_j^* X_r := &- \int_{]s,r]} e_j^*[F(\omega,u,\bar{Y}_{u-},Z_u) - F(\omega,u,\bar{Y}_{u-},\bar{Z}_u)]d\mu_u \\ &+ \sum_i \int_{]s,r]} e_j^*[Z_u^i - \bar{Z}_u^i]dM_u^i \end{aligned}$$

is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$ *supermartingale on* $[s,T]$*.*

(iv) For all $t \in [s,T]$, with $Y_t \geq \bar{Y}_t$, for almost all ω, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, which may depend on ω and t, such that if for all $r \in [t-\epsilon, t]$ and all j

$$\begin{aligned}
e_j^* Y_r - E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}&\left[\int_{]r,t]} e_j^* F(\omega, u, Y_{u-}, Z_u) d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r\right] \\
&\geq e_j^* \bar{Y}_r - E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}\left[\int_{]r,t]} e_j^* F(\omega, u, \bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u) d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r\right],
\end{aligned}$$

then $Y_r \geq \bar{Y}_r$ componentwise, for all $r \in [t-\epsilon, t]$.

It is then true that $Y \geq \bar{Y}$ on $[s,T]$, except possibly on some evanescent set.

Proof. We omit the ω and t arguments of F for clarity. Either the comparison must hold for all r, or, as the set $[0,\infty[^K$ is closed in $\mathbb{R}^K$ and $Y - \bar{Y}$ is right continuous, there exists a stopping time τ and a set $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $Y_\tau - \bar{Y}_\tau \geq 0$ componentwise, and for all ϵ sufficiently small, $Y_{\tau-\epsilon} - \bar{Y}_{\tau-\epsilon} < 0$ in at least one component, on A. Note ϵ will, in general, depend on ω.

We now consider the BSDE with terminal conditions $Y_\tau \geq \bar{Y}_\tau$, and respective drivers $I_{t\leq\tau} F$ and $I_{t\leq\tau}\bar{F}$. These BSDEs will also satisfy the conditions of the theorem, with the same measures $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$.

Then, for $r > s$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_r - \bar{Y}_r - &\int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau}[F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - \bar{F}(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u)] d\mu_u \\
&+ \sum_i \int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau}[Z_u^i - \bar{Z}_u^i] dM_u^i = Y_\tau - \bar{Y}_\tau \geq 0
\end{aligned}. \tag{12}$$

This can be rearranged to give

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_r - \bar{Y}_r - &\int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau}[F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)] d\mu_u \\
\geq &\int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau}[F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u) - \bar{F}(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u)] d\mu_u \\
&+ \int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau}[F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u)] d\mu_u \\
&- \sum_i \int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau}[Z_u^i - \bar{Z}_u^i] dM_u^i.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We have that

$$\int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau}[F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u) - \bar{F}(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u)] d\mu_u \geq 0$$

by assumption (ii). As $e_j^* X_r$ is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$ supermartingale and τ is bounded by T, we know that the process given by

$$\begin{aligned}
e_j^* \tilde{X}_r &:= e_j^* X_{r\wedge\tau} - E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}[e_j^* X_\tau | \mathcal{F}_r] \\
&= E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j}\Big[\int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau} e_j^* [F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u)] d\mu_u \\
&\qquad - \sum_i \int_{]r,T]} I_{u\leq\tau} e_j^* [Z_u^i - \bar{Z}_u^i] dM_u^i \Big| \mathcal{F}_r\Big]
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

is also a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$-supermartingale, with $e_j^*\tilde{X}_\tau = 0$ $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$-a.s. Hence $e_j^*\tilde{X}_r \geq 0$.

For each j, taking a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j|\mathcal{F}_r$ conditional expectation throughout (13) and premultiplying by e_j^* gives

$$e_j^*Y_r - e_j^*\bar{Y}_r - E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j}\left[\int_{]r,\tau]} e_j^*[F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)]d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r\right] \geq 0.$$

This must hold for all $r \leq \tau$ and almost all ω. Considering this equation pathwise, we see that by Assumption (iv), for almost all ω, for sufficiently small ϵ, this implies that for all $r \in [\tau(\omega) - \epsilon(\omega), \tau(\omega)]$ we have $Y_r - \bar{Y}_r \geq 0$. On A, this contradicts the construction of τ, and hence it follows that the comparison must hold for all times.

As $Y - \bar{Y}$ is càdlàg, we have that $Y - Y$ is indistinguishable from a nonnegative process and, therefore, the inequality holds up to evanescence. □

Remark 7.2. Assumption (iv) essentially guarantees that there will not be a *first* time at which the comparison holds, prior to which it does not hold. By right continuity, we know that either the comparison holds at all times, or there will exist such a first time. Hence, the comparison must hold at all times.

Remark 7.3. Assumption (iv) is clearly trivial whenever F does not depend on Y.

Remark 7.4. Assumption (iii) is very closely related to the *Fundamental theorem of Asset Pricing* (see [11]), as it relates an inequality in current values to the existence of an equivalent (super-)martingale measure.

Definition 7.1. *A standard driver F such that assumptions (iii) and (iv) of Theorem 7.1 hold on $[0,T]$ for all $Y, Z, \bar{Y}$ and $\bar{Z}$ will be called* balanced.

Theorem 7.2. *In the scalar ($K = 1$) case, assumption (iv) of Theorem 7.1 holds for any standard F.*

Proof. Let $\delta Y := Y - \bar{Y}$. Let t be a fixed time with $\delta Y_t \geq 0$. By pathwise right continuity, there exists a (stochastic) $\epsilon > 0$ such that, except possibly on some $\mathbb{P}$-null set, either $\delta Y_r \geq 0$ for all $r \in [t - \epsilon, t]$, or $\delta Y_r < 0$ for all $r \in [t - \epsilon, t]$.

Denote those ω where the latter case applies by A. On A, we suppose, without loss of generality, that $c_s \geq 1$, and that ϵ is sufficiently small that $\int_{]t-\epsilon,t]} c_s d\mu_s < 1$. Such an ϵ will exist as c_s is bounded and $c_s\Delta\mu_s < 1$.

Now suppose for all $r \in [t - \epsilon, t]$, omitting the ω and t arguments of F,

$$\begin{aligned} &Y_r - E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]r,t]} F(Y_{u-}, Z_u)d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r\right] \\ &\qquad \geq \bar{Y}_r - E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]r,t]} F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, on A, as $\delta Y_r < 0$ by construction, by Lipschitz continuity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta Y_r| &\leq E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]r,t]} F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r\right] \\ &\leq \int_{]r,t]} c_u E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[|\delta Y_{u-}| | \mathcal{F}_r\right] d\mu_u \end{aligned}$$

Now let $w_r := E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[|\delta Y_r||\mathcal{F}_{t-\epsilon}]$. We have the inequality

$$w_r \leq \int_{]r,t]} c_s w_{s-} d\mu_s$$

for all $r > t - \epsilon$. Taking a left limit in r and applying Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$w_{r-} \leq \int_{[r,t]} c_s w_{s-} d\mu_s$$

and hence by integration and Fubini's theorem, either $w_{r-} = 0$ or

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{]t-\epsilon,t]} c_r w_{r-} d\mu_r &\leq \int_{]t-\epsilon,t]} c_r \left(\int_{[r,t]} c_s w_{s-} d\mu_s \right) d\mu_r \\
&= \int_{]t-\epsilon,t]} \left(\int_{]t-\epsilon,s]} c_r d\mu_r \right) c_s w_{s-} d\mu_s \\
&< \int_{]t-\epsilon,t]} c_s w_{s-} d\mu_s.
\end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, and so $w_{r-} = 0$ for all $r \in]t-\epsilon, t]$. Therefore, by monotonicity of the conditional expectation, we know $\delta Y_r = 0$ for all $r \in]t-\epsilon, t]$, on A. As we know that $\delta Y_r < 0$ for all $r \in]t-\epsilon, t]$ on A, it must be that A is empty. The result follows. ☐

Definition 7.2. *The comparison between* Y *and* $\bar{Y}$ *will be called* ***strict*** *on* $[s,T]$ *if the conditions of Theorem 7.1 hold, and, for any* $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ *such that* $Y_s^1 = Y_s^2$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* A*, we have* $Y_u^1 = Y_u^2$ *on* $[s,T] \times A$*, up to evanescence.*

Lemma 7.1. *If the comparison is strict on* $[s,T]$*, then for any* $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ *such that* $Y_s^1 = Y_s^2$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* A*, it follows that*

- $Q = \bar{Q}$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* A*,*
- $F(\omega, u, \bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u) = \bar{F}(\omega, u, \bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u)$ $\mu \times \mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* $[s,T] \times A$*, and*
- *for* $r \in [s,T]$*, up to indistinguishability, on* A*,* $\|Z_t - \bar{Z}_t\|_{M_t} = 0$*.*

Proof. We omit the ω and t arguments of F and $\bar{F}$ for clarity. Let $\tilde{X}$ be as in (14), and let S be the process defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
e_j^* S_r :=\ & e_j^* E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}\left[Q - \bar{Q} \middle| \mathcal{F}_r \right] \\
&+ e_j^* E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i}\left[\int_{]r,T]} [F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u) - \bar{F}(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u)] d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r \right] + \tilde{e}_j^* X_r.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Then $e_j^* S$ is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$-supermartingale, as the first term is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$-martingale, the second is nonincreasing in r by Assumption (ii) of Theorem 7.1, and the third is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j$-supermartingale by Assumption (iii) of Theorem 7.1. Furthermore, each of these terms is nonnegative.

Taking a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j|\mathcal{F}_r$ conditional expectation through (3), we have that, for all $r \in [s,T]$,

$$e_j^*(Y_r - \bar{Y}_r) = e_j^* S_r + E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]r,t]} e_j^*[F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)] d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_r \right]. \tag{16}$$

If $Y_r = \bar{Y}_r$ on $[s,T] \times A$ up to evanescence, then it is clear from (16) that $S_r = 0$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $[s,T] \times A$. Hence, by nonnegativity, each of the terms on the right hand side of (15) must be zero. The first two points of the lemma immediately follow.

Consider the BSDE (3) satisfied by $\bar{Y}$. As $F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u) = \bar{F}(Y_{u-}, Z_u)$ $\mu \times \mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $[s,T] \times A$ and $Q = \bar{Q}$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on A, we know that

$$\bar{Y}_r - \int_{]r,T]} \bar{F}(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u) d\mu_u + \sum_i \int_{]r,T]} \bar{Z}^i_u dM^i_u = \bar{Q}$$

is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. equal to

$$\bar{Y}_r - \int_{]r,T]} F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, \bar{Z}_u) du + \sum_i \int_{]r,T]} \bar{Z}^i_u dM^i_u = Q.$$

Hence, in A, $(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z})$ is a solution at time r to the BSDE defining (Y, Z).

As the solution to this BSDE is unique, it follows that, on $[s,T] \times A$, $\|\bar{Z} - Z\|_{M_t} = 0$ up to indistinguishability. ☐

Theorem 7.3 (Strict Comparison). *Consider the scalar, ($K = 1$), case, where F is balanced. Then the comparison is strict on $[s,T]$ for all s.*

Proof. Again, as $K = 1$ we can omit e_j from all equations, and we omit the ω and t arguments of F and $\bar{F}$ for clarity. Let S_r be as defined in (15), and note that S is a nonnegative $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-supermartingale.

Taking a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}|\mathcal{F}_s$ conditional expectation of (16) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[Y_r - \bar{Y}_r \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] &= E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[S_r + \int_{]s,t]} [F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)] d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] \\
&\quad - E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]s,r]} [F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)] d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] \\
&\le S_s + E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]s,t]} [F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)] d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] \\
&\quad + \int_{]s,r]} E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[|F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)| \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] du \\
&\le S_s + E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]s,t]} [F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)] d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] \\
&\quad + c \int_{]s,r]} E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[|Y_{u-} - \bar{Y}_{u-}| \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] d\mu_u.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

We know from (16) and the assumption $Y_s - \bar{Y}_s = 0$ on A that

$$I_A S_s + I_A E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\int_{]s,t]} [F(Y_{u-}, Z_u) - F(\bar{Y}_{u-}, Z_u)] d\mu_u \middle| \mathcal{F}_s\right] = I_A (Y_s - \bar{Y}_s) = 0,$$

and so, as $Y - \bar{Y}$ is nonnegative by Theorem 7.1, premultiplication of (17) by I_A and then taking an expectation gives

$$E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[I_A (Y_r - \bar{Y}_r)] \le c \int_{]s,r]} E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[I_A (Y_{u-} - \bar{Y}_{u-})] d\mu_u.$$

As all quantities are nonnegative, taking a limit from below yields

$$E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[I_A(Y_{r-} - \bar{Y}_{r-})] \leq c \int_{]s,r]} E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[I_A(Y_{u-} - \bar{Y}_{u-})] d\mu_u.$$

and an application of (the forward version of) Grönwall's Lemma implies

$$E_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[I_A(Y_r - \bar{Y}_r)] \leq 0.$$

By nonnegativity, it follows that $Y_r = \bar{Y}_r$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. on A. Again, as $Y - \bar{Y}$ is càdlàg, this shows that $Y = \bar{Y}$ on $[s,t] \times A$, up to evanescence. □

Corollary 7.3.1. *If the ith component of $F(\omega, t, y, z)$ depends only on the ith component of y, (as well as on ω, t and z), then the comparison is strict.*

Proof. As the ith component of F depends only on the ith component of y, we can repeat the construction of Theorem 7.3 in each component. The result follows. □

8 Nonlinear expectations

We are now in a position to explicitly construct nonlinear expectations in a general probability space. We shall not here consider the more general theory of nonlinear evaluations. An approach without these restrictions can be seen in [8]. These operators, discussed in [17], are closely related to the theory of dynamic risk measures, as in [3], [19], [1] and others, as each concave nonlinear expectation $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t)$ corresponds to a dynamic convex risk measure through the relationship

$$\rho_t(Q) = -\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t).$$

A further discussion of this relationship can be found in [19].

Definition 8.1. *A family of operators*

$$\mathcal{E}(\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t) : L^2(\mathcal{F}_T) \to L^2(\mathcal{F}_t), 0 \leq t \leq T$$

*is called an $\mathcal{F}_t$-consistent **nonlinear expectation** if $\mathcal{E}(\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t)$ satisfies the following properties.*

1. *If $Q \geq \bar{Q}$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. componentwise*

   $$\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t) \geq \mathcal{E}(\bar{Q}|\mathcal{F}_t) \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. componentwise}$$

   with equality iff $Q = Q'$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

2. *For $Q \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_t)$, $\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t) = Q$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.*

3. *For any $s \leq t$,*

   $$\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t)|\mathcal{F}_s) = \mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_s) \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

4. *For any $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,*

   $$I_A\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t) = \mathcal{E}(I_A Q|\mathcal{F}_t) \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Theorem 8.1. *Let F be a balanced driver which does not depend on Y, (i.e. $c_t \equiv 0$) and satisfies $F(\omega, t, y, 0) = 0$ $\mu \times \mathbb{P}$-a.s. Then the operator defined by*

$$\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t) = Y_r$$

where Y is the solution to a BSDE (3) with driver F, is a nonlinear expectation.

Proof.

1. As F is balanced, this result follows directly from the Comparison theorem (Theorem 7.1). As F does not depend on Y, the strict comparison will also hold, by Corollary 7.3.1.
2. Consider the BSDE (3) on $[t, T]$

   $$Y_s - \int_{]s,T]} F(\omega, u, Y_{u-}, Z_u)du + \sum_i \int_{]s,T]} Z_u^i dM_u^i = Q.$$

   This has a solution $Y_s = Q$, $Z_s = 0$. As $Q \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_t)$, this solution is adapted and, by Theorem 5.1, unique. Therefore $\mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t) = Y_t = Q$ as desired.
3. By definition the BSDE with terminal condition Q at time T has solution Y_t at time t. Simple manipulation of the BSDE (3) at time s shows that Y_s is also the time s solution to the BSDE with terminal condition Y_t at time t. Hence, by property 2, Y_s solves both the BSDE with terminal condition $Y_t = \mathcal{E}(Q|\mathcal{F}_t)$ and the BSDE with terminal condition Q.
4. Consider the BSDE with driver F and terminal condition Q. Multiplying by I_A, as $I_A F(\omega, t, y, z) = F(\omega, t, I_A y, I_A z)$, we see that $(I_A Y, I_A Z)$ is the solution to the BSDE with driver F and terminal condition $I_A Q$, as desired.

□

Remark 8.1. It is known in discrete time ([7]), and under some conditions in continuous time ([9]), that BSDEs describe all nonlinear expectations, subject to some boundedness conditions. It is likely that a similar result will hold in this setting. However, obtaining such a result is beyond the scope of this paper.

9 Conclusions

We have constructed BSDEs in a general filtered probability space, using only basic properties of the filtration. We have presented conditions for the existence of unique solutions to these equations, and seen how these are related to the conditions in both the classical setting, and the discrete time setting. We have given a comparison theorem for these solutions, which allows the construction of nonlinear expectations in these spaces.

These results are significantly more general than those previously available, as they make very few assumptions on the underlying probability space. A consequence of this is that a possibly infinite dimensional martingale representation theorem is required. In full generality, they also make no assumptions regarding the relationship of the integrator of the driver and the quadratic variations of the martingale terms. At the same time, this general setting provides an approach unifying the theory of BSDEs in discrete and continuous time.

References

[1] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, David Heath, and Hyejin Ku. Coherent multiperiod risk adjusted values and Bellman's principle. *Annals of Operations Research*, 152:5–22, July 2007.

[2] Guy Barles, Rainer Buckdahn, and Etienne Pardoux. Backward stochastic differential equations and integral-partial differential equations. *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports*, 60(1):57–83, 1997.

[3] Pauline Barrieu and Nicole El Karoui. Optimal derivatives design under dynamic risk measures. In George Yin and Qin Zhang, editors, *Mathematics of Finance*, volume 351 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 13–26, Providence, RI., 2004. A.M.S. Proceedings.

[4] Samuel N. Cohen and Robert J. Elliott. Solutions of backward stochastic differential equations on Markov chains. *Communications on Stochastic Analysis*, 2(2):251–262, August 2008.

[5] Samuel N. Cohen and Robert J. Elliott. Backward stochastic difference equations and nearly-time-consistent nonlinear expectations. forthcoming, 2009.

[6] Samuel N. Cohen and Robert J. Elliott. Comparisons for backward stochastic differential equations on Markov chains and related no-arbitrage conditions. to appear in *Annals of Applied Probability*, 2009.

[7] Samuel N. Cohen and Robert J. Elliott. A general theory of finite state backward stochastic difference equations. forthcoming, 2009.

[8] Samuel N. Cohen, Robert J. Elliott, and Charles E.M. Pearce. A general comparison theorem for backward stochastic differential equations. forthcoming, 2009.

[9] François Coquet, Ying Hu, Jean Memin, and Shige Peng. Filtration consistent nonlinear expectations and related g-expectations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 123(1):1–27, May 2002.

[10] Mark H. A. Davis and Pravin Varaiya. The multiplicity of an increasing family of σ-fields. *The Annals of Probability*, 2(5):958–963, October 1974.

[11] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. *The Mathematics of Arbitrage*. Springer, 2006.

[12] Nicole El Karoui and S-J Huang. *Backward Stochastic Differential Equations*, chapter 2: A general result of existence and uniqueness of backward stochastic differential equations, pages 27–36. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics. Longman, 1997.

[13] Robert J. Elliott. *Stochastic Calculus and its Applications*. Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1982.

[14] Ying Hu, Jin Ma, Shige Peng, and Song Yao. Representation theorems for quadratic $\mathcal{F}$-consistent nonlinear expectations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 118:1518–1551, September 2008.

[15] Jean Jacod and Albert N. Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for Stochastic Processes.* Number 288 in Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2003.

[16] Shige Peng. *Stochastic Methods in Finance*, chapter 4: Nonlinear Expectations, Nonlinear Evaluations and Risk Measures, pages 165–254. Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2004.

[17] Shige Peng. Dynamically consistent nonlinear evaluations and expectations. Preprint No. 2004-1, Institute of Mathematics, Shandong University, available at *http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0501415*, 2005.

[18] Daniel Revuz and Mark Yor. *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion.* Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, third edition, 1999.

[19] Emanuela Rosazza Gianin. Risk measures via $g-$expectations. *Insurance Mathematics and Economics*, 39:19–34, 2006.